



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Environment-sensitive mass changes influence breeding frequency in a capital breeding marine top predator

Citation for published version:

Smout, SC, King, R & Pomeroy, P 2020, 'Environment-sensitive mass changes influence breeding frequency in a capital breeding marine top predator', *Journal of Animal Ecology*, vol. 89, no. 2, pp. 384-396. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13128>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1111/1365-2656.13128](https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13128)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Journal of Animal Ecology

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Environment-sensitive mass changes influence breeding frequency in a capital breeding marine top predator

Sophie Smout¹,

Ruth King² &

Patrick Pomeroy³

Keywords: *Halichoerus grypus*, fecundity, mass, state space model

Data supporting this publication can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.17630/8b1f33d5-50bf-4631-9e65-fca33d26902>

¹ scs10@st-andrews.ac.uk SMRU, University of St Andrews, St Andrews KY16 8LB
(corresponding author)

² Ruth.King@ed.ac.uk School of Mathematics, University of Edinburgh, James Clark Maxwell Building, The King's Buildings, Peter Guthrie Tait Road, Edinburgh EH9 3FD

³ pp6@st-andrews.ac.uk SMRU, University of St Andrews, St Andrews KY16 8LB
(corresponding author)

19 Abstract

20 1. The trade-off between survival and reproduction in resource-limited iteroparous animals
21 can result in some individuals missing some breeding opportunities. In practice, even with
22 the best observation regimes, deciding whether ‘missed’ years represent real pauses in
23 breeding or failures to detect breeding can be difficult, posing problems for the estimation
24 of individual reproductive output and overall population fecundity.

25 2. We corrected fecundity estimates by determining if breeding had occurred in skipped
26 years, using long term capture-recapture observation datasets with parallel longitudinal
27 mass measurements, based on informative underlying relationships between individuals’
28 mass, breeding status and environmental drivers in a capital breeding phocid, the grey seal.

29 3. Bayesian modelling considered interacting processes jointly: temporal changes in a
30 phenotypic covariate (mass); relationship of mass to breeding probability; effects of
31 maternal breeding state and mark type on re-sighting. Full reproductive histories were
32 imputed, with the status of unobserved animals estimated as breeding or non-breeding,
33 accounting for local environmental variation. Overall fecundity was then derived for Scottish
34 breeding colonies with contrasting pup production trends.

35 4. Maternal mass affected breeding likelihood. Mothers with low body mass at the end of
36 breeding were less likely to bear a pup the following year. Successive breeding episodes
37 incurred a cost in reduced body mass which was more pronounced for North Rona, Outer
38 Hebrides (NR) mothers. Skipping breeding increased subsequent pupping probability
39 substantially for low mass females. Poor environmental conditions were associated with
40 declines in breeding probability at both colonies. Seal mass gain between breeding seasons
41 was: (i) negatively associated with lagged North Atlantic Oscillation for seals at NR, ; (ii)
42 positively associated with an index of seal prey (*Ammodytes* spp) abundance at Isle of May,

43 Firth of Forth (IM). Overall fecundity was marginally greater at IM (increasing/stable pup
44 production) than at NR (decreasing). No effects of mass were detected on maternal survival.
45 5. Skipping breeding in female grey seals appears to be an individual mass-dependent
46 constraint moderated by previous reproductive output and local environmental conditions.
47 Different demographic trends at breeding colonies were consistent with the fecundities
48 estimated using this method, which is general and adaptable to other situations.

Introduction

Resource limitation results in animals making trade-offs between traits such as survival and reproduction: costly expenditure on breeding can impact future survival or reproduction (Stearns, 1992). Iteroparous long-lived species may trade off current and future reproduction when a reproductive episode is sacrificed in favour of survival. True capital breeders must acquire resources in advance of a breeding attempt to provision themselves and their offspring throughout the breeding season. Fasting during reproduction means that maternal resources are finite. Individuals may differ in their ability to acquire resources according to age or experience (Beauplet, Barbraud, Dabin, Küssener & Guinet, 2006; Desprez, Pradel, Cam, Monnat & Gimenez, 2011); individual quality (Hamel, Cote, Gaillard & Festa-Bianchet, 2009) or population density (Hamel, Côté & Festa-Bianchet, 2010). Moreover, environmental conditions may lead to changing resource availability and individual life history schedules are more likely to feature missed breeding attempts when conditions are unfavourable (Cubaynes, Doherty, Schreiber & Gimenez, 2011; Forcada, Trathan & Murphy, 2008; Parsons 2008; Soldatini, Albores-Barajas, Massa & Gimenez, 2016). Skipped breeding episodes may allow individuals to maintain survival and together these impact Lifetime Reproductive Output. Population fecundity is affected when sufficient such events occur.

The probability of a seal giving birth to a pup is associated with individual body condition, which results from foraging success (Guinet, Roux, Bonnet & Mison 1998; Stenson, Buren &

72 Koen-Alonso 2016; Ferguson *et al.* 2017). The mass of a mature female at the start of
73 lactation is a proxy for body condition which can vary between years but also sets limits on
74 maternal expenditure (the net change in maternal mass from birth to weaning of the pup) in
75 phocid seals (Arnborn, Fedak & Boyd 1997). Few studies have examined the consequences
76 of breeding expenditures between seasons for individuals in capital breeding species. Grey
77 seal (*Halichoerus grypus*) mothers expending substantial resources in one breeding season
78 were less likely to return to breed in the subsequent year (Pomeroy, Fedak, Rothery &
79 Anderson 1999). Therefore a mother's mass in one season may influence the probability
80 that she breeds in the subsequent year, depending on her ability to regain condition
81 through successful foraging. In other marine predators, biotic and/or abiotic environmental
82 fluctuations can influence foraging success by changing prey availability, with consequences
83 for predator condition, reproductive success and survival (Frederiksen, Lebreton, Pradel,
84 Choquet & Gimenez, 2014; King, Brooks, Morgan & Coulson, 2005; Bost *et al.*, 2015,
85 McMahon, Harcourt Burton, Daniel & Hindell, 2017).

86
87 Overall, the UK grey seal population has increased in recent decades. Grey seals breed at
88 approximately 60 colonies in Scotland and the long term decline in pup production at North
89 Rona (NR) in the Outer Hebrides contrasts with the growth and stabilization seen at the Isle
90 of May (IM) in the North Sea, reflecting wider regional variation between grey seal breeding
91 colonies (Duck & Morris, 2016; Smout, King & Pomeroy, 2011a). Currently, an age-
92 structured population model is fitted to pup production data using Bayesian methods to
93 estimate grey seal abundance in UK waters (Thomas *et al.*, in press). This model is applied to
94 wide geographical areas, each of which includes many breeding colonies. As the model's fit

and output are sensitive to prior assumptions concerning vital rates, the accuracy, precision and representativeness of estimates used to inform the priors of the population model are of fundamental importance, with fecundity a key parameter (Øigård, Frie, Nilssen & Hammill 2012).

Determining how often animals breed can be challenging, requiring information additional to that needed to estimate survival (Desprez, Gimenez, McMahon, Hindell & Harcourt, 2017). Ideally, breeding events can be compiled from direct observations on known, representative individuals, occurring over the duration of the animals' lifespan, with individuals equally detectable and breeding state known without error. The latter is problematic even for long term studies – if an animal is not observed in a given year but is resighted later, is this a failure to detect a breeding episode or a non-breeding year for that animal? In practice determining animals' breeding status when they are not observed at the main study site is difficult and this has prompted development of statistical methods to account for uncertain state and individual heterogeneity (Rouan, Gaillard, Guédon and Pradel 2009; King & McCrea 2014; Desprez *et al.* 2017).

Here we use long-term data from the grey seal breeding colonies on NR and IM including state specific capture-mark-recapture records and a time-varying covariate, body mass, to impute the breeding likelihood of female grey seals in skipped breeding years. Simple estimates of fecundity based on those animals that are observed to attend the colony in a given year can give an inflated fecundity rate as non-breeding animals may be less likely to attend (or even if they attend, be re-sighted at) a breeding colony compared to breeding animals. Therefore, in order to obtain realistic fecundity estimates, it is important to

consider the breeding status of seals that are not observed, potentially because they are absent from the study colony when observations are collected. Although grey seals are known to show fidelity to their breeding colonies and philopatry (Pomeroy, Anderson, Twiss & McConnell 1994; Pomeroy, Smout, Moss, Twiss & King 2010) this remains a challenge, because the numerous/inaccessible alternative breeding colonies are difficult to monitor adequately through the breeding season (Harrison *et al.* 2006). We use a Bayesian state-space approach (Royle 2008; King 2012; King & McCrea 2014; Juez, Aldalur, Herrero, Galarza & Arizaga 2015), assuming that changes in individual mass depend on the breeding status of animals, and that the probability of subsequent breeding is dependent on body mass (Pomeroy *et al.*, 1999). Using an underlying process model for the trajectory of individual mass over time, we estimate the mass and pupping status of unobserved animals, and hence obtain overall estimates of fecundity for grey seals breeding at the NR and IM colonies. Within the same integrated modeling framework we test for associations between mass, vital rates, and environmental drivers (sandeel abundance index for IM, and the NAO index for NR) and the predicted impacts of these on individual breeding probability and colony pup production.

Methods

Study colonies and individuals

NR (59.12° N, 5.83° W) Outer Hebrides is 65 km north-west of Cape Wrath, Scotland. The pupping season on NR spans mid September to late November (Boyd, Lockie & Hewer 1962; Hiby *et al.* 2013) with peak pupping in early October. Annual pup production declined from around 2500 in the 1960s to around 500 at present. IM (56.18°N, 2.55°W) lies at the mouth

of the Firth of Forth, Scotland. Until the 1970's few seals bred there, but annual production was over 2000 pups by the 1990s and has fluctuated around this number since then (Duck & Morris 2016). The pupping season is from early October to early December, peaking in early November. Researchers were present on NR typically between 25 Sep-4 Nov and on IM from 25 Oct-6 Dec.

Results are based on analysis of data from 584 known adult females at NR covering the period 1993-2013; on the IM, data were available for 273 adult females from 1987-2014 (Table 1). At both colonies, individuals were marked with tags or brands, or identified using natural pelage patterns (Smout *et al.*, 2011a). Some animals carried combinations of marks, sometimes applied at different times, with new animals added to the data set throughout the study period (Pomeroy *et al.* 1999; Smout *et al.* 2011a). Most study animals at NR were 'marked' as breeding adults, very few tagged pups recruited there (Pomeroy *et al.* 2010). At IM, up to 25% of known mothers in the early 2000s onwards had retained tags applied when they were pups. Further details of study animals, mark-recapture protocols and the Cormack-Jolly-Seber (CJS) model for the mark-recapture process including tag loss are reported elsewhere (Pomeroy *et al.* 1994; Smout, King & Pomeroy 2011b; McCrea & Morgan 2014).

Table 1.	NR	IM
Years of data collection	1993-2013	1987-2014
Number of marked animals	584 (394)	273 (1)
Number of marked animals with associated mass data	210	217

Table 1: Numbers and categories of study animals at each colony. In the second row are counts of animals in the mark-recapture data set, with animals entering the study in different years during the study period at each site (numbers in parentheses represent animals identified by pelage-ID only, while the totals include all animals including those identified with multiple marks for at least some of the years they were observed.) In the third row are animals with associated mass data.

Throughout each breeding season, at each colony, researchers surveyed the main breeding areas daily and the more outlying areas every 3-4d so that seals were identified as soon as possible after coming ashore. When birth date was not observed directly, it was estimated using age-related mass and development characteristics (Kovacs & Lavigne 1986).

Mother/pup pairs were captured and weighed twice, as close to the start and end of lactation as possible to allow estimation of maternal postpartum mass (M) directly after the pup is born, and maternal weaning mass (W) at the end of lactation, maternal absence defined weaning date (protocol in Pomeroy *et al.*, 1999). Average normal lactation duration was 18d (range 14-23d) and we aimed for a minimum of 10d between captures (typically days 3 and 15 of 18). The study included seals that bred regularly, as well as intermittent and rarely-sighted breeders. At both colonies, study animals were originally branded or flipper-tagged as adults and their pups tagged (Smout *et al.* 2011a); additional pups were tagged at weaning (Pomeroy *et al.*, 2010). "New" animals were added regularly for weighing. Age ranges of mothers from each colony were similar (5-35 NR, 6-34 IM: ages were determined from reading incisor tooth sections, or from resights of recruited tagged pups, Pomeroy *et al.*, 2010). Not all seals captured had a tooth removed for ageing. At NR from 1998 as many animals as possible were identified by natural markings, many of these remained observed but not weighed or aged (Hiby *et al.*, 2013).

Environmental correlates

UK grey seals are capital breeders: lactating females fast, relying on body reserves accrued during the preceding foraging period. Food abundance over the year preceding breeding was expected to play an important role in determining grey seal breeding success (Pomeroy *et al.*, 1999). To link between breeding, food abundance and environmental conditions, we selected environmental correlates *a priori* which were relevant to grey seal regional diets, assuming that both breeding and foraging occurred within the same respective general areas for each colony (Hammond & Wilson 2016; Russell *et al.* 2013).

The North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) annual winter index offers a broad scale measure of annual meteorological fluctuations, and it has been associated with vital rates of different species (Thompson & Ollason 2001; King *et al.* 2005; Sandvik, Erikstad, Barrett and Yoccoz 2005). We used 1-year lagged annual winter NAO (i.e. relating to the winter prior to breeding) to index food (1-group forage fish, Hammond & Wilson 2016) abundance. In the UK, the sandeel *Ammodytes marinus* is found consistently in grey seal diet samples. This high-energy prey appears to be of particular importance for east coast seal populations (Cury *et al.* 2011; Hammond & Wilson 2016). Indices of sandeel abundance are available in some areas of the North Sea including areas close to the IM (ICES 2016). However, direct estimates of sandeel abundance are not consistently available for west coast areas used by NR seals and sandeels are also less important in west coast seal diets (Hammond, Hall & Prime 1994; Hammond & Wilson 2016). Sandeels are an important dietary component for seals foraging around IM therefore sandeel abundance associated with spring/summer (when sandeels are in the water column and available to fishing) during the year leading up

to grey seal breeding was used as a covariate for the IM colony (ICES 2016; Hammond & Wilson 2016) .

Analytical framework

Adapting the CJS model, we assumed animals were identified by unique marks during each breeding season (Lebreton, Burnham, Clobert & Anderson. 1992). Individuals were recorded as 1 or 0 ('seen' or 'not seen'). Pupping status was recorded similarly. Direct mass measurements were obtained for some of the individuals in the study. We adopted a Bayesian state-space modeling approach, offering some important advantages e.g. the user can include informative priors to constrain the parameter search; and sampling from the posterior distribution of parameters allows for inference about quantities calculated from model parameters. Adapting the CJS model for this framework required us to separate the process model (which includes survival and pupping) from the observation model (animals may or may not have been observed). However, the level of detail that could be included was limited, due to the nature and quantity of the data available. Because the link between phenology, breeding and environment was a primary concern, our modelling focused on this, explicitly including links from environment to individual mass and pupping history, and then to vital rates. This contrasts with models that assume time-dependent survival/breeding/recapture probabilities that are common to all individuals, estimating them separately for each year. In our approach, processes such as foraging success and mark loss drove the state of the individual (its mass, breeding status and marks present) through the study period (King 2014; King, Morgan, Gimenez & Brooks 2009). The observation process (whether or not the animal was observed) depended on the state of the animal including its breeding status and identifying marks. After initial exploratory

analyses the initial CMR model in which vital rates depended on mass was further simplified by excluding mass-dependence in survival rate for both study systems, as there was little evidence for this dependence structure, and survival was estimated separately for each colony.

Process model

Maternal expenditure, represented by mass loss during lactation, was estimated using a general multiplier β acting on maternal postpartum mass (Pomeroy *et al.*, 1999; Wheatley, Bradshaw, Harcourt & Hindell, 2008; Figure1). Thus for a female j pupping in year t the expected mass of a female at the start of the breeding season $M_{j,t}$ was related to her mass at the end of breeding season

$$W_{j,t} \sim N(\beta M_{j,t}, \sigma_W^2)$$

The true mass of the female was assumed to be Normally distributed around the expected value, reflecting both the individual variation between females, and observation error in mass measurement. The mass of a female j at the end of breeding in year t influenced mass at the beginning of breeding in year $t + 1$ subject to an additional colony and year-specific environmental effect ε_t common to all animals, breeders and non-breeders. The effect of pregnancy on expected mass gain was estimated by the factor δ such that for a pregnant female pupping in year $t + 1$, with the true mass of the female assumed to be Normally distributed:

$$M_{j,t+1} \sim N(\delta \varepsilon_t W_{j,t}, \sigma_M^2)$$

260

261

262 Thus combining the above modelling components, for a female pupping in year $t + 1$ the
 263 expected relationship between end-of-season masses in year t and $t + 1$ is given by:

264

$$265 \quad E(W_{j,t+1}) = \varepsilon_t \delta \beta W_{j,t}$$

266

267 For a non-pupping female, there was no effect of pregnancy on mass gain and no lactation,
 268 so $\delta \beta$ were both set to 1. For these non-breeding animals the expected relationship is
 269 described by:

270

$$271 \quad E(W_{j,t+1}) = \varepsilon_t W_{j,t}$$

272

273 The product $\delta \beta$ could be interpreted as a general estimate of the ratio between the end-
 274 of-season mass for breeding and non-breeding females. Both constants were estimable
 275 because we observe values of both $W_{j,t}$ and $M_{j,t}$ in the data set, allowing direct estimation
 276 of β from data on breeding animals. As previously, maternal masses $W_{j,t}$
 277 were assumed to be Normally distributed with constant variance.

278

279 The year-dependent mass-gain ε_t was modelled as a function of the respective
 280 environmental variable (1 year lagged NAO for NR, and sandeel abundance for IM)
 281 represented here by x_t

282

$$283 \quad \varepsilon_t = a + bx_t$$

where a and b were estimated. If the 95% BCI (Bayesian Credible Interval) around the estimate for the parameter b did not include zero, this was taken as evidence for an association between mass gain and the environmental variable.

Pupping was treated as a Bernoulli process with underlying probability $f_{j,t+1}$. This was associated with maternal weaning mass $W_{j,t}$ in the previous year, scaled by the year-effect. A logistic relationship was assumed:

$$f_{j,t+1} = \frac{\exp(a_p + b_p \varepsilon_t W_{j,t})}{1 + \exp(a_p + b_p \varepsilon_t W_{j,t})}$$

Colony-specific values for a_p and b_p were estimated. If the 95% BCI around the estimate for the b_p did not include zero, this was taken as evidence for an association between pupping probability $f_{j,t+1}$ and $W_{j,t}$. The sign of b_p indicated the type of association.

Because we could not distinguish between animals that died and any that permanently emigrated from the study population we estimated ‘apparent survival’, abbreviated to ‘survival’ hereafter. Preliminary investigations into the effects of maternal mass on survival did not find evidence for a strong effect of mass on survival so the model structure was adjusted and survival was estimated as a constant value for each colony (see S1).

The model included the possibility that some females, referred to here as ‘transients’, were available to be seen on only one occasion (Pradel, Hines, Lebreton & Nichols. 1997; Hiby *et*

al. 2013). We estimated the colony-specific probability $p_{transient}$ that an animal identified for the first time was in this category.

Observation model

We estimated distinct parameters p_{pup} representing the re-sighting probability of breeding females, and $p_{no\ pup}$ for non-breeding females. Seals were marked with brands, flipper tags, and pelage markings. Mark-dependent values of re-sighting probability were estimated during the model-fitting process for NR and IM separately. The probability of tag loss could also be estimated, because some animals carried multiple mark types e.g. tags and brands. Brands and pelage-ID were treated as permanent marks (Smout *et al.* 2011a; S1).

Estimation

The Bayesian fitting algorithm estimated values of female mass where gaps occurred in series (Figure 1). Similarly, the unknown pupping status of unobserved animals was estimated based on observed masses in the previous and subsequent years. Unknown mass values and model parameters were estimated using the freely-available open source software WinBUGS (Lunn, Spiegelhalter Thomas & Best 2009). A model description, equations and priors are detailed in Supplementary Material (S1); code is provided in (S2). Convergence was checked based on visual inspection of plots for multiple chains and BGR convergence statistics (Gelman *et al.* 2013).

Checking goodness-of-fit

With a complex data set and substantial missing data, it is difficult to directly estimate goodness of fit or to use information criteria such as DIC to carry out model comparison (Celeux, Forbes, Robert & Titterton 2006). To address the question of goodness of fit we have implemented an approach with the same underlying principle as a Bayesian p -value, but focused on the estimation of net fecundity - the quantity of particular interest in this study. In particular our aim is to compare simulated fecundity rates (conditional on the initial sighting and observed mass if any) with estimated rates drawn from the posterior distribution of the parameters (i.e. from the MCMC iterations) to identify whether or not they are comparable. If the estimates are comparable there is no evidence against the model; alternatively, if they are systematically different this suggests a lack of absolute model fit with regard to fecundity. This fecundity rate was then used as the associated “discrepancy function”: we compared the estimated fecundity from the posterior distribution with the associated simulated fecundity given these particular parameter values. This process was repeated for 1000 random draws from the posterior. We then record the proportion of simulated fecundity rates that were higher than the associated fecundity rate for that posterior sample. As for a formal Bayesian p -value, if simulated and fitted rates are similarly distributed, this proportion is expected to be around 0.5, and this then indicates a satisfactory correspondence between model and data; whereas a proportion in the “tails” (e.g. lower or upper 5% quantiles) would indicate a potential lack of model fit (King *et al.*, 2009).

Model predictions for pupping probabilities; the effects of varying environmental conditions

To explore the implications of the fitted model, we estimated the effect of environmental drivers on the probability of pupping. ‘Poor environmental conditions’, chosen from the original covariate data, were defined as the values of sandeel abundance or NAO that predicted lowest proportional mass gain. ‘Good conditions’ were those values of environmental covariates for which predicted proportional mass gain was highest. We estimated the ‘skipping point maternal weaning mass’ W_{50} as the mass of the mother when her pup weaned at which pupping probability in the next year would be 50%, if conditions during the intervening year were poor. This was calculated using the fitted model for each colony. Similarly the probability of pupping for a female with mass at weaning W_{50} after a year of good conditions was also calculated. Therefore, in effect we tested a theoretical ‘skipping point mother’ against the worst and best conditions observed in the data.

The consequences of the variable environment, were explored further by estimating pupping probabilities for females starting at W_{50} after two years of good conditions, and after two years of poor conditions. These values were calculated either assuming that pupping took place in the breeding season after the first year, or that it did not.

Model predictions for local population trends

To explore the consequences of our model estimates for local populations, we used a simple Leslie matrix population simulation for females breeding at IM and NR, assuming no density-dependent effects were acting and accounting for transients. In this model all animals became fertile aged 6, adult and sub-adult survival rates were set at the mean estimated values for adults for each colony, and fecundity was set to the mean colony average estimate. Female first-year survival was set at 0.6 for IM (Hall & McConnell 2007) and for

NR this value was set at $0.6s_{NR}/s_{IM}$ where s_{NR} and s_{IM} were the estimated adult survival rates at NR and IM.

Results

After a 2000 iteration burn-in period, the MCMC for NR and IM appeared to converge with stationary posterior parameter estimates achieved after 100,000 iterations. Breeding parameter estimates are summarized in Table 2, for full parameter table see Supplementary Material (S1). The estimated values from our Goodness of Fit tests were 0.307 for NR and 0.284 for IM which were both satisfactory, indicating acceptable model fit for fecundity rate estimation.

Parameter estimates

Table 2.	Meaning	NR value	IM value
s	Overall survival rate (average over all years)	0.89 (0.87, 0.90)	0.94 (0.93, 0.95)
f	General estimate of fecundity for all animals at the colony, including years they are not observed at the colony	0.79 (0.77, 0.81)	0.82 (0.79, 0.84)
β	Ratio of W (maternal mass at weaning) to M (maternal post partum mass)	0.65 (0.64, 0.66)	0.65 (0.65, 0.66)
δ	Maternal mass gain (preg)	1.34 (1.32, 1.36)	1.40 (1.38, 1.42)
p_{pup}	Probability that a female marked with a brand (i.e. highly visible) and pupping is present and will be seen at the colony	0.89 (0.85, 0.93)	0.83 (0.80, 0.86)
$p_{no\ pup}$	Probability that an animal marked with a brand which is not pupping will be seen at the colony	0.08 (0.06, 0.11)	0.05 (0.03, 0.08)
$P_{transient}$	Probability that a female recorded in the data set for the first time is a 'transient'	0.21 (0.16, 0.27)	0.04 (0.01, 0.09)
$P_{tagloss}$	Annual probability of tag loss	0.07 (0.05, 0.09)	0.02 (0.01, 0.03)

Table 2: Mean parameter estimates for the process and observation models (95% Bayesian credible intervals are shown in brackets).

393

394 Mean survival rate at NR was lower than at IM, consistent with previous findings (Smout *et*
395 *al.* 2011a). There were more mothers estimated as ‘transient’ at NR than at IM (Table 2).

396

397 For both colonies there was evidence for a positive relationship between pupping
398 probability in year $t + 1$ and W_t (maternal mass at the end of breeding in year t) with
399 appreciable effects on pupping probability over the range of mass values observed in the
400 data set (Figure 2). The IM pupping probability-mass curve shows a steeper relationship
401 than that for NR: at IM, pupping probability doubles from 0.4 to 0.8 over a range of
402 approximately 13kg while at NR the same change occurs over a range of approximately
403 23kg.

404

405 Average net fecundity calculated for NR females is less than that for IM females, but
406 credible intervals overlap for the two sites. For comparison, a simple calculation based on
407 the observational data, assuming that all unobserved known animal-years were non-
408 breeding years, gave net fecundity rates of 0.679 at NR and 0.750 at IM, highlighting the
409 importance of accounting for unobserved individuals.

410

411 The estimated probability of re-sighting a non-breeding female was low at both colonies,
412 consistent with the observation that very few non-breeding adult females are seen at these
413 colonies (Table 2).

414

415 The postpartum masses of mothers at NR and IM encompassed a similar range, with several
416 at each colony exceeding 250kg. The estimated value of β (the ratio of maternal mass at the

end of lactation to mass at start of lactation) was very similar between IM and NR: on average, a mother expended 35% of her postpartum mass on raising a pup (Table 2). Average proportional mass gain δ for pregnant mothers between end and start of successive breeding seasons was lower for those at NR than for those at IM (Table 2).

Environmental variation and breeding probability

There was no evidence for an association between mass gain and NAO at IM, so this was excluded from the final fitted model. The relationship between mass gain and sandeel abundance at IM was positive (Figure 3). For NR, the underlying relationship between mass gain and NAO index was negative (Figure 4).

Year specific proportional mass gains ε_t were generally larger at NR than at IM (Figures 3,4; right panels). Synchronicity of environmental effects at the two colonies was limited; better than average mass gains occurred at both colonies in 1995 and 2010.

The predicted effects of environment and breeding on subsequent pupping probability are important for ‘skipping point’ W_{50} animals at both colonies (p_{t+1} in Table 3). Not breeding has an appreciable effect for skipping point animals, where pupping probability p_{t+2} can either decrease if pupping takes place in year $t+1$, or increase if breeding is skipped (Table 3, columns 4 and 5). Mothers at the skipping point were heavier at NR (93.5kg) than at IM (88.5kg).

Table 3.	Environmental conditions	p_{t+1}	p_{t+2} (pupped $t+1$)	p_{t+2} (skipped $t+1$)
NR	Poor - High NAO	0.500	0.423	0.696

	Good - Low NAO	0.633	0.675	0.884
IM	Poor - Low sandeels	0.500	0.426	0.709
	Good - High sandeels	0.620	0.647	0.868

Table 3: The predicted impacts of environmental conditions. ‘Skipping point’ mothers of mass W_{50} in year t have a 50% probability of pupping in year $t+1$ after a ‘poor’ year of environmental conditions. If environmental conditions are better (low NAO at NR, high sandeels at IM) then pupping probability in year $t+1$ is improved (p_{t+1} column 3). Predicted pupping probabilities for year $t+2$ are shown after 2 years of consistent environmental conditions (2 good years or 2 bad years), in columns 4 and 5. Column 4 gives values for females if they bred in year $t+1$; Column 5 gives values for females that ‘skipped’ breeding in year $t+1$.

Population trajectory for each colony

The predicted time series of number of females breeding derived from the Leslie model declined at NR and increased at IM (dashed and solid lines respectively, Figure 5). Simple visual comparison suggests that there is a good correspondence with trends in pup production estimates derived from synoptic counts of pups from aerial survey (NR, IM solid and open circles respectively, Duck & Morris 2016).

Discussion

Intermittent breeding in iteroparous animals acts on LRO and individual fitness, and affects demographic rates at the population level. Capital breeding species in fluctuating environments are likely to be particularly prone to skipping breeding episodes, when survival takes precedence over reproduction (Stearns, 1992). Skipped breeding episodes among experienced breeders are known in capital breeding phocid seals, but mechanistic

explanations of the process have often relied anecdotally on Boyd's (2000) finding that body mass accounted for more variation in pregnancy rates in capital breeding than income breeding species (e.g. Chambert, Rotella, Higgs & Garrott, 2013; Desprez et al., 2017). Desprez et al. (2017) used resighting records at Macquarie Island to investigate intermittent breeding of southern elephant seals *Mirounga leonina*. Using a multi-event model incorporating uncertain reproductive status and categorizing adult females into breeding heterogeneity classes, they found that there was a survival cost to breeding for females in the infrequently breeding class. This latter class they suggested comprised females of lower quality in some phenotypic property positively related to fitness, and while variability in individuals' ability to forage and gain resources were hypothesized to be likely explanatory factors, no phenotypic or other measures of animals were provided to support this (Desprez et al., 2017). Similarly, Chambert, Rotella & Garrott, (2015) proposed that female Weddell seals (*Leptonychotes weddellii*) that skipped breeding in Erebus Bay, Antarctica were in poorer condition than regular breeders. Here, we provide the empirical evidence for an effect of maternal mass on pupping probability in a capital breeding phocid, the grey seal, and importantly, of the increased pupping probability that low body mass females accrue by skipping a reproductive episode.

Environmental fluctuations are seen to impact long-lived marine species' fecundity rather than survival (Reed, Harris & Wanless, 2015; Stenson et al., 2016). Our study showed an impact of female mass on the probability of pupping but did not detect an effect on survival. While a female in sufficiently poor condition might be expected to have reduced survival probability, this may be difficult to observe. If low-mass animals miss breeding, are not observed at the colony and are never seen again we may lack the data to define the shape

of the descending arm of the logistic curve for the survival-mass relationship. If breeding is costly, animals in poor condition (low body mass) may forego breeding and improve their own chances of survival (Ronget, Garratt, Lemaître & Gaillard 2017). We found that impacts of breeding on subsequent pupping probability for grey seals are substantial for seals whose mass at end of breeding is low (Figure 2). At both colonies our model predicts that in poor environmental conditions, females that ‘skip’ breeding are more likely to pup in subsequent years (Table 3). Similar skipping breeding sequences were linked with body condition and environmental conditions in Weddell seals (Proffitt, Garrott, Rotella & Wheatley 2007; Chambert et al., 2015).

Mass-adjusted fecundity rates suggest that around two-thirds of “missing” years are indeed non-breeding years (Table 2). Movement away from the natal colony or permanent emigration by adults to different colonies might occur, and cannot be distinguished here from permanent loss of fertility, or death (Harrison et al., 2006). Nevertheless, our analyses suggest breeding occurred in around one third of “missed” breeding years. Some pupping events of known females at their “normal” colony could have gone unobserved, but high resight rates (Table 2) suggest these should be few. The remaining ‘missed’ breeding events must have occurred outwith the prevalent breeding site fidelity pattern (Pomeroy et al. 1994). Genetic differences between NR and IM seals are sufficient to suggest very low effective breeding interchange between distant colonies (Allen, Amos, Pomeroy & Twiss, 1995), but any breeding colony infidelity would help explain unassigned paternities (Worthington Wilmer, Allen, Pomeroy, Twiss & Amos 2003).

Some female grey seals observed for the first time became subsequently unobservable, especially at NR (Table 2). Although termed “transients”, different phenomena can produce such records. Most convincing is the difficulty in making matches between patterns extracted from different photographs of the same grey seal identified by pelage alone (Hiby *et al.* 2013), as many more females were identified by this method at NR (Table 1). Alternative explanations include: some subset of adult females have lower survival e.g. primiparous females; higher tag loss rates directly after application; different tag loss rates between seals at different colonies. Seals may visit a colony once only, then breed elsewhere subsequently - features of a declining colony such as NR may indicate to first time visitors that it is undesirable, resulting in demographic state-dependent colony fidelity.

Intermittent breeding has been described as a tactic employed by poorer quality mothers to optimize LRO (Desprez *et al.*, 2017). True capital breeders rely on accumulated reserves, expending a large proportion of postpartum body mass (grey seals 0.35, Table 2; southern elephant seals 0.35, Arnborn *et al.*, 1997) to sustain a reproductive episode. Average proportional expenditure was the same at NR and IM, despite body mass differences and different vital rates. Pregnant NR seals did not regain as much of their previous MPPM as equivalent mothers at IM ($\delta = 1.34, 1.40$ respectively, Table 2), suggesting that successive pregnancies incur a cost in reduced subsequent MPPM and that NR mothers experienced this to greater extent, possibly as a result of poorer overall resource availability. Further reductions in mass of small mothers would be unsustainable and in such cases skipping breeding seems likely. While a mother experiences strong selective pressure on raising a pup within resource limits, the future costs of which vary according to initial maternal body mass and reserves, individual and episodic variations in reproductive expenditure occur

(Arnbom et al., 1997; Pomeroy et al., 1999). However, even for capital breeders, body mass alone may not be a perfect metric of body reserves, because it masks the availability of all the nutrients required for a successful breeding episode. Often only lipid reserves are used to estimate “condition” in capital breeders as they provide most of the energetic requirements of mother and offspring, but protein and other nutrients must also be available and in the extreme may be more limiting (eg Arnbom et al., 1997; Boyd, 2000; Mellish, Iverson & Bowen, 1999; Hanson, Smout, Moss & Pomeroy, in press). Our modelling framework could be adapted to include more complex measures of body condition in future studies, including combining different measures, if such data are available.

Assessing the effects of different demographic rates on populations requires that rates are estimated appropriately: for fecundity, non-breeders and non-breeding episodes must be taken into account (Lee, Reid & Beissinger 2017). Here, we found that relatively small differences in colony fecundity rate are associated with very different colony pup production trajectories. Canadian and Norwegian studies of grey seals have reported fecundity estimates similar to our mass-adjusted overall female fecundity rates (Bowen, Iverson, McMillan & Boness 2006; Hammill & Gosselin 1995). Nevertheless, fecundity and adult female survival were both lower for NR seals than those at the growing IM colony, which had similar parameters to those reported from the expanding colony on Sable Island, Canada (den Heyer & Bowen, 2017). Simple Leslie matrix population simulations showed rates of local population growth and decline that are consistent with observed trends in pup production at both colonies for the early years of the study: a decline in pup production at NR, compared with a positive trend at IM (Duck & Morris 2016). The breeding decline at NR is present at other Hebridean grey seal colonies (Duck & Morris 2016) and poor

recruitment of seals tagged as pups to NR is a likely additional factor in explaining these trends (Pomeroy *et al.*, 2010). Long term declines in measures of grey seal “condition” at NR compared to IM suggests that colony-level effects are reflected in individual phenotypic covariates and these are a local response to local conditions (Hanson *et al.*, in press) which likely explains lower fecundity at NR (Boyd, 2000). Longitudinal seabird surveys on NR have shown decadal declines in 9 of 15 species that use the island for breeding, in common with trends reported in such species elsewhere in the North Atlantic (Murray & Wilson 2013). That many different marine apex predators show contemporaneous regional declines is indicative of the generality of ecosystem change to their detriment in this region.

Grey seals are generalist predators and their diet varies in response to changing prey abundance (Smout, Rindorf, Hammond, Harwood & Matthiopoulos 2013). As capital breeders capable of wide-ranging foraging, they are buffered against small scale, short term changes in prey availability. The association between NAO (lagged one year) and grey seal mass change at NR, is explicable if Atlantic atmospheric conditions correlate with the abundance of one or more important prey species with direct consequences for the condition of seals foraging and breeding on the UK’s Atlantic fringe. There was no evidence of a similar effect of NAO at IM, consistent with the limited influence of NAO on the North Sea ecosystem where most IM seals forage, compared to west coast waters that are connected directly to the Atlantic (Harris, Edwards & Olhede 2014). The appreciable effect of local sandeel abundance reflects the importance of sandeels in seal diets in this area and the wider North Sea where these seals are likely to forage (Russell *et al.*, 2013; Hammond & Wilson 2016).

The Bayesian modelling approach implemented here using freely available software allowed us to fit a model of the relationship between annual mass gain and environmental drivers, including ‘nuisance’ processes (tag loss) that might otherwise obscure important effects and a realistic observation model with missing data and unknown states. Our analyses highlighted the consequential nature of breeding events: longitudinal maternal mass trajectories suggested underlying breeding histories, and while skipping breeding was associated with low body mass, females that skipped had a higher probability of breeding subsequently.

Ethics

Work involving animals in this study was licensed under UK Home Office project 60/4009 or preceding versions and conformed to the UK Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act, 1986. Research was approved by the University of St Andrews Animal Welfare and Ethics Committee.

Data accessibility

Data are lodged in PURE, <http://dx.doi.org/10.17630/8b1f33d5-50bf-4631-9e65-fca33d26902f>.

Authors' contributions

PP designed and managed the long term research and carried out fieldwork; PP and RK conceived of and designed the study; SCS analyzed the data; SCS and PP led writing of the paper and share first authorship. All authors gave final approval for publication.

602 Competing interests

603 The authors have no competing interests.

604 Funding

605 UK Natural Environment Research Council funding to the Sea Mammal Research Unit
606 enabled this work. PP was in receipt of NERC grant no. NE/G008930/1 and Esmée Fairbairn
607 Foundation funding during the work. SCS was supported as a postdoctoral fellow (EPSRC
608 award to RK and PP). Funders had no role in the planning, execution, analysis or writing of
609 this study.

610 Acknowledgements

611 Thanks to all involved with field data collection, particularly Simon Moss and Sean Twiss.
612 Useful discussions and advice came from Lex Hiby, Len Thomas, Steve Buckland, Dave
613 Thompson and Mike Fedak. Callan Duck and Chris Morris kindly provided pup production
614 figures. We thank staff at Scottish Natural Heritage, Northern Lighthouse Board, the
615 Offshore Medical Unit at Aberdeen Royal Infirmary and the Maritime and Coastguard
616 Agency for their co-operation and assistance.

617

Bibliography

- Allen, P.J., Amos, W., Pomeroy, P.P., and Twiss, S.D. (1995). Microsatellite variation in grey seals *Halichoerus grypus* shows evidence of genetic differentiation between two British breeding colonies. *Molecular Ecology* **4**: 653–662. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.1995.tb00266.x>
- Arnbom, T., Fedak, M.A. & Boyd, I.L. (1997) Factors affecting maternal expenditure in Southern elephant seals during lactation. *Ecology*, **78**, 471–483. [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658\(1997\)078\[0471:FAMEIS\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(1997)078[0471:FAMEIS]2.0.CO;2)
- Beauplet, G, Barbraud, C., Dabin, W., Küssener, C., & Guinet, C. (2006). Age-specific survival and reproductive performances in fur seals: Evidence of senescence and individual quality. *Oikos*, **112**, 430–441. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2006.144412.x>
- Bost, C.A., Cotte, C., Terray, P., Barbraud, C., Bon, C., Delord, K., Gimenez, O., Handrich, Y., Naito, Y., Guinet, C. & Weimerskirch, H. (2015). Large-scale climatic anomalies affect marine predator foraging behaviour and demography. *Nature Communications*, **6**, Article number 8220. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms9220>.
- Bowen, W.D., Iverson, S.J., McMillan, J.I. & Boness, D.J. (2006) Reproductive performance in grey seals: age-related improvement and senescence in a capital breeder. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **75**, 1340–1351. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.1450>.
- Boyd, I.L. (2000). State-dependent fertility in pinnipeds: Contrasting capital and income breeders. *Functional Ecology*, **14**, 623–630. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2435.2000.t01-1-00463.x>
- Boyd, J.M., Lockie, J.D. & Hewer, H.R. (1962) The breeding colony of grey seals on North Rona, 1959. *Journal of Zoology*, **138**, 257–277.
- Celeux, G., Forbes, F., Robert, C.P. & Titterton, D.M. (2006) Deviance information criteria for missing data models. *Bayesian Analysis*, **1**, 651–673.
- Chambert, T., Rotella, J.J. & Garrott, R.A. (2015) Female Weddell seals show flexible strategies of colony attendance related to varying environmental conditions. *Ecology*, **96**, 479–488.
- Chambert, T., Rotella, J.J., Higgs, M.D. & Garrott, R.A. (2013) Individual heterogeneity in reproductive rates and cost of reproduction in a long-lived vertebrate. *Ecology and Evolution*, **3**, 2047–2060. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.615>
- Cubaynes, S., Doherty, P.F., Schreiber, E.A., & Gimenez, O. (2011). To breed or not to breed: A seabird's response to extreme climatic events. *Biology Letters*, **7**, 303–306. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2010.0778>
- Cury, P.M., Boyd, I.L., Bonhommeau, S., Anker-Nilssen, T., Crawford, R.J.M., Furness, R.W., Mills, J.A., Murphy, E.J., Österblom, H., Paleczny, M., Piatt, J.F., Roux, J.-P., Shannon, L. & Sydeman, W.J. (2011) Global seabird response to forage fish depletion - One-third for the birds. *Science*, **334**, 1703–1706. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1212928>
- den Heyer, C.E & Bowen W.D. (2017). Estimating changes in vital rates of Sable Island gray seals using mark-recapture analysis. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2017/054, pp27. http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas-sccs/Publications/ResDocs-DocRech/2017/2017_054-eng.html, Accessed July 2018.
- Desprez, M., Pradel, R., Cam, E., Monnat, J.Y. & Gimenez, O. (2011). Now you see him, now you don't: Experience, not age is related to reproduction in kittiwakes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, **278**, 3060–3066. <https://doi.org/10.1089/rspb.2011.0189>

- Desprez, M., Gimenez, O., McMahon, C.R., Hindell, M.A. & Harcourt, R.G. (2017). Optimizing lifetime reproductive output: Intermittent breeding as a tactic for females in a long-lived, multiparous mammal. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **87**, 199–211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12775>
- Duck, C.D. and Morris, C.D (2016) Grey seal pup production. Briefing Paper 16/01. In *Special Committee on Seals, Scientific advice on matters related to the management of seal populations: 2016*. Natural Environmental Research Council, Sea Mammal Research Unit. University of St Andrews, St Andrews. 169pp. <http://www.smru.st-andrews.ac.uk/research-policy/scos/>. Accessed July 2018.
- Ferguson, S.H., Young, B.G., Yurkowski, D.J., Anderson, R., Willing, C. & Nielsen, O. (2017) Demographic, ecological, and physiological responses of ringed seals to an abrupt decline in sea ice availability. *PeerJ*, **5**, e2957. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2957>
- Frederiksen, M., Lebreton, J.-D., Pradel, R., Choquet, R. & Gimenez, O. (2014) Identifying links between vital rates and environment: a toolbox for the applied ecologist. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **51**, 71–81. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12172>
- Forcada, J., Trathan, P.N., & Murphy, E. J. (2008) Life history buffering in Antarctic mammals and birds against changing patterns of climate and environmental variation. *Global Change Biology*, **14**, 2473–2488. <https://doi.org/j.1365-2486.2008.01678.x>
- Gelman, A., Carlin, J.B., Stern, H.S., Dunson, D.B., Vehtari, A. & Rubin, D.B. (2013) Bayesian Data Analysis (3rd ed.). CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Guinet, C., Roux, J. P., Bonnet, M., and Mison, V. (1998). Effect of body size, body mass, and body condition on reproduction of female South African fur seals (*Acrocephalus pusillus*) in Namibia. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **76**, 1418–1424. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjz-76-8-1418>
- Hall, A.J. & McConnell, B.J. (2007) Measuring changes in juvenile gray seal body composition. *Marine Mammal Science*, **23**, 650–665. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.2007.00132.x>
- Hamel, S., Cote, S.D, Gaillard, J.M. & Festa-Bianchet, M. (2009). Individual variation in reproductive costs of reproduction: High quality females always do better. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **78**, 143–151. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01459.x>
- Hamel, S., Cote, S.D & Festa-Bianchet, M. (2010). Maternal characteristics and environment affect the costs of reproduction in female mountain goats. *Ecology*, **91**, 2034–2043. <https://doi.org/10.1890/09-1311.1>
- Hammill, M.O. & Gosselin, J.F. (1995) Grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*) from the Northwest Atlantic: female reproductive rates, age at first birth, and age of maturity in males. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, **52**, 2757–2761. <https://doi.org/10.1139/f95-864>
- Hammond, P.S. & Wilson, L.J. (2016) Grey Seal Diet Composition and Prey Consumption. *Marine Scotland, Scottish Marine and Freshwater Science*, **7**, 1–52. <https://doi.org/10.7489/1799-1>
- Hammond, P.S., Hall, A.J. & Prime, J.H. (1994) The diet of grey seals in the Inner and Outer Hebrides. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **31**, 737. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2404164>
- Hanson, N, Smout, S, Moss, S, Pomeroy, P. Colony-specific differences in decadal longitudinal body composition of a capital-breeding marine top predator. *Aquatic Conservation: Mar Freshw Ecosyst.* 2019; 29(S1): 131– 143. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3093>
- Harris, V., Edwards, M. & Olhede, S.C. (2014) Multidecadal Atlantic climate variability and its impact on marine pelagic communities. *Journal of Marine Systems*, **133**, 55–69.

703

704 Harrison, P.J., Buckland, S.T., Thomas, L., Harris, R., Pomeroy, P.P. & Harwood, J. (2006) Incorporating
 705 movement into models of grey seal population dynamics. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **75**, 634–
 706 645. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2006.01084.x>

707 Hiby, L., Paterson, W.D., Redman, P., Watkins, J., Twiss, S.D. & Pomeroy, P. (2013) Analysis of photo-
 708 id data allowing for missed matches and individuals identified from opposite sides. *Methods in*
 709 *Ecology and Evolution*, **4**, 252–259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210x.12008>

710 ICES. (2016) Report of the Benchmark Workshop on Sandeel (WKSAN). *ICES Working Group on*
 711 *Sandeel*, International Council for the Exploration of the Seas, Copenhagen, Denmark, pp
 712 307. <http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/CM Documents/CM-2010/ACOM/ACOM5710.pdf>. Accessed
 713 July 2018.

714 Juez L, Aldalur A, Herrero A, Galarza A, Arizaga J. (2015) Effect of Age, Colony of Origin and Year on
 715 Survival of Yellow-Legged Gulls *Larus michahellis* in the Bay of Biscay. *Ardeola*. **62**(1):139–50.
 716 King, R. (2012) A review of Bayesian state-space modelling of capture–recapture–recovery data.
 717 *Interface Focus*, **2**, 190-204. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsfs.2011.0078>

718 King, R. (2012) A review of Bayesian state-space modelling of capture–recapture–recovery data.
 719 *Interface Focus*, **2**, rsfs20110078–204. King, R. (2014) Statistical Ecology. *Annual Review of*
 720 *Statistic and Its Application*, **1**, 401–426. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-022513-](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-022513-115633)
 721 [115633](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-022513-115633)

722 King, R., Brooks, S.P., Morgan, B.J.T. & Coulson, T. (2005) Factors influencing Soay sheep survival: A
 723 Bayesian analysis. *Biometrics*, **62**, 211–220. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0420.2005.00404.x>

724

725 King, R. and McCrea, R. S. (2014) A Generalised Likelihood Framework for Partially Observed Capture-
 726 recapture-recovery Models. *Statistical Methodology* **17** 30-45.
 727 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stamet.2013.07.004>

728 King, R., Morgan, B., Gimenez, O. & Brooks, S. (2009) *Bayesian Analysis for Population Ecology*. CRC
 729 Press, Boca Raton, Florida.

730 Kovacs, K. & Lavigne, D. (1986) Growth of grey seal *Halichoerus grypus* neonates: differential
 731 maternal investment in the sexes. *Canadian Journal of Zoology – Revue Canadienne de Zoologie*,
 732 **64**, 1937 –1943.

733 Lebreton, J.-D., Burnham, K.P., Clobert, J. & Anderson, D.R. (1992) Modeling survival and testing
 734 biological hypotheses using marked animals: A unified approach with case studies. *Ecological*
 735 *Monographs*, **62**, 67–118. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2937171>

736 Lee, A.M., Reid, J.M. & Beissinger S.R. (2017) Modelling effects of nonbreeders on population growth
 737 estimates *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **86**, 75-87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12592>

738 Lunn, D., Spiegelhalter, D., Thomas, A. & Best, N. (2009) The BUGS project: Evolution, critique and
 739 future directions. *Statistics in Medicine*, **28**, 3049–3067. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.3680>

740 McCrea, R.S. & Morgan, B.J.T. (2014). *Analysis of Capture-Recapture Data*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
 741 Boca Raton, Florida.

742 McMahon CJ, Harcourt RG, Burton HR, Daniel O, & MA Hindell (2017) Seal mothers expend more on
 743 offspring under favourable conditions and less when resources are limited. *Journal of Animal*
 744 *Ecology* **86**, 359-370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12611>

- 745 Mellish, J.E., Iverson, S.J. & Bowen, W.D. (1999). Variation in milk production and lactation
746 performance in grey seals and consequences for pup growth and weaning characteristics.
747 *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology* **72** (6), 677–690. <https://doi.org/10.1086/316708>
- 748 Murray, S. & Wilson, L.J. (2013) The status of breeding seabirds on North Rona, Outer Hebrides in
749 2012. *Scottish Birds*, **33**, 745–757. [https://www.the-soc.org.uk/files/docs/about-](https://www.the-soc.org.uk/files/docs/about-us/publications/.../sb-vol33-no01.pdf)
750 [us/publications/.../sb-vol33-no01.pdf](https://www.the-soc.org.uk/files/docs/about-us/publications/.../sb-vol33-no01.pdf). Accessed July 2018.
- 751 Øigård, T.A., Frie, A.K., Nilssen, K.T. & Hammill, M. O. (2012) Modelling the abundance of grey seals
752 (*Halichoerus grypus*) along the Norwegian coast. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **69**, 1436–1447.
753 <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fss103>
- 754 Parsons, M. (2008) Seabirds as indicators of the marine environment. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*,
755 **65**, 1520–1526. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsn155>
- 756 Pomeroy, P.P., Anderson, S.S., Twiss, S.D. & McConnell, B.J. (1994) Dispersion and site fidelity of
757 breeding female grey seals (*Halichoerus grypus*) on North Rona, Scotland. *Journal of Zoology*,
758 **233**, 429–447. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.1994.tb05374.x>
- 759 Pomeroy, P.P., Fedak, M.A., Rothery, P. & Anderson, S. (1999) Consequences of maternal size for
760 reproductive expenditure and pupping success of grey seals at North Rona, Scotland. *Journal of*
761 *Animal Ecology*, **68**, 235–253. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2656.1999.00281.x>
- 762 Pomeroy, P., Smout, S., Moss, S., Twiss, S. & King, R. (2010) Low and delayed recruitment at two grey
763 seal breeding colonies in the UK. *Journal of Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Science*, **42**, 125–133.
764 <https://doi.org/10.2960/J.42.m651>
- 765 Pradel, R., Hines, J.E., Lebreton, J.D. & Nichols, J.D. (1997) Capture-recapture survival models taking
766 account of transients. *Biometrics*, **53**, 60–72. [doi 10.2307/2533097](https://doi.org/10.2307/2533097)
- 767 Proffitt, K. M., Garrott, R. A., Rotella, J. J., and Wheatley, K. E. (2007). Environmental and senescent
768 related variations in Weddell seal body mass: Implications for age-specific reproductive
769 performance. *Oikos*, **116**: 1683–1690. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2007.16139.x>
- 770 Reed, T.E., Harris, M.P. & Wanless, S. (2015) Skipped breeding in common guillemots in a changing
771 climate: restraint or constraint? *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, **3**, 43–13. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2015.00001)
772 [10.3389/fevo.2015.00001](https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2015.00001)
- 773 Ronget, V., Garratt, M., Lemaître, J.-F. & Gaillard, J.-M. (2017) The “Evo-Demo” implications of
774 condition-dependent mortality. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **32**, 909–921.
775 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.09.003>
- 776 Rouan, L., Gaillard, J.-M., Guédon, Y. & Pradel, R. (2009) Estimation of lifetime reproductive success
777 when reproductive status cannot always be assessed. In D.L. Thomson, E.G. Cooch & M.J. Conroy
778 (Eds.), *Modeling Demographic Processes In Marked Populations*, pp. 867–879. Springer, Boston,
779 Massachusetts.
- 780 Royle, J.A. (2008) Modeling individual effects in the Cormack–Jolly–Seber model: A state–space
781 formulation. *Biometrics*, **64**, 364–370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0420.2007.00891.x>
- 782 Russell, D.J.F., McConnell, B., Thompson, D., Duck, C., Morris, C., Harwood, J. & Matthiopoulos, J.
783 (2013) Uncovering the links between foraging and breeding regions in a highly mobile mammal.
784 *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **50**, 499–509. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12048>
- 785 Sandvik, H., Erikstad, K.E., Barrett, R.T. & Yoccoz, N.G. (2005) The effect of climate on adult survival in
786 five species of North Atlantic seabirds. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **74**, 817–831. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2005.00981.x)
787 [10.1111/j.1365-2656.2005.00981.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2005.00981.x)

- 788 Smout, S., King, R. & Pomeroy, P. (2011a) Estimating demographic parameters for capture–recapture
789 data in the presence of multiple mark types. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics*, **18**, 331–
790 347. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10651-010-0135-y>
- 791 Smout, S., King, R. & Pomeroy, P. (2011b) Integrating heterogeneity of detection and mark loss to
792 estimate survival and transience in UK grey seal colonies. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **48**, 364–
793 372. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01913.x>
- 794 Smout, S., Rindorf, A., Hammond, P.S., Harwood, J. & Matthiopoulos, J. (2013) Modelling prey
795 consumption and switching by UK grey seals. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **71**, 81–89.
796 <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fst109>
- 797 Soldatini, C., Albores-Barajas, Y.V., Massa, B., & Gimenez, O. (2016). Forecasting ocean warming
798 impacts on seabird demography: A case study on the European storm petrel. *Marine Ecology*
799 *Progress Series*, **552**, 255–269. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps11730>
- 800 Stearns, S. (1992). *The evolution of life histories*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- 801 Stenson, G.B., Buren, A.D. & Koen-Alonso, M. (2016) The impact of changing climate and abundance
802 on reproduction in an ice-dependent species, the Northwest Atlantic harp seal, *Pagophilus*
803 *groenlandicus*. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **73**, 250–262.
804 <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsv202>
- 805 Thomas, L. (2016) Estimating the size of the UK grey seal population between 1984 and 2014. In
806 *Special Committee on Seals: Scientific Advice on Matters Related to the Management of Seal*
807 *Populations: 2016*. Natural Environmental Research Council, Sea Mammal Research Unit.
808 University of St Andrews, St Andrews. 169pp. [http://www.smru.st-andrews.ac.uk/research-](http://www.smru.st-andrews.ac.uk/research-policy/scos/)
809 [policy/scos/](http://www.smru.st-andrews.ac.uk/research-policy/scos/). Accessed July 2018.
- 810 Thomas L., Russell DJF, Duck CD, Morris CD, Lonergan M, Empacher F, Thompson D & Harwood J. (in
811 press) Modelling the population size and dynamics of the British grey seal. *Aquatic*
812 *Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*
- 813 Thompson, P.M. & Ollason, J.C. (2001) Lagged effects of ocean climate change on fulmar population
814 dynamics. *Nature*, **413**, 417–420. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35096558>
- 815 Wheatley, KE Bradshaw CJA, Harcourt RG & Hindell MA (2008) Feast or famine: evidence for mixed
816 capital-income breeding strategies in Weddell seals. *Oecologia* **155**, 11–20.
- 817 Worthington Wilmer J, P. J. Allen, P. P. Pomeroy, S. D. Twiss & W. Amos (1999) Where have all the
818 fathers gone? An extensive microsatellite analysis of paternity in the grey seal (*Halichoerus*
819 *grypus*). *Molecular Ecology* **8** (9), 1363–1561. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-294x.1999.00705.x>

820